



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,298	06/20/2001	Keith Barracough	8X8S.244PA	2678
7590	07/12/2005		EXAMINER	
Crawford PLLC Suite 390 1270 Northland Drive St. Paul, MN 55120			ENG, GEORGE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/885,298	BARRACLOUGH, KEITH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George Eng	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is in response to the Amendment filed 4/11/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 12-17, 23-29 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325248A) in view of Schneider et al. (US PAT. 5,929,897 hereinafter Schneider).

Regarding claim 1, Nabavi discloses a surveillance system comprising a second communications system (11, figure 1) communicatively coupled and adapted to transmit image data, a programmable surveillance system (8, figure 1) including a first computer arrangement (1 and 10, figure 1) for processing data including image data, and including a camera (6, figure 1) configured and arranged to capture images, wherein the captured images are processed as data by the first computer arrangement, and wherein the programmable system is configured to receive the request for image data and to automatically access and deliver image to the second communication system, and a second computer arrangement (9, figure 1) for communicatively

coupling with the second communication system and for processing data including image data and configured and arranged to retrieve image data delivered by the first computer arrangement (page 3 line 12 through page 8 line 22). Nabavi differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a first communicate on system communicatively coupled and adapted to deliver a request for image data so that the first computer arrangement is configured to receive the request for image data from the first communication system. However, Schneider teaches a cost effective method for establishing a video communication between a remote station and a central facility by delivering a request for establishing a video call, i.e., image data communication, over a POTS, i.e., a first communication system, and then the central facility, read as the first computer arrangement, is operable for automatically establishing video communication to the high bandwidth channel, i.e., a second communication system, in response to the request received from the first communication system (col. 1 lines 53-61, col. 4 lines 30-41 and col. 5 line 64 through col. 6 line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nabavi in having the first communication system communicatively coupled and adapted to deliver a request for image data so that the first computer arrangement is configured to receive the request for image data from the first communication system, as per teaching of Schneider, in order to establish the video communication in a cost effective manner.

Regarding claim 2, Nabavi discloses at least one of the first and second communications systems including the Internet, wherein the programmable surveillance system accesses the Internet by logging on to the Internet via an Internet service provider (page 4 lines 3-24).

Regarding claims 3-5, Schneider discloses at least one of the first and second communications systems including a plain-old-telephone-system, wireless system or a paging system (col. 6 line 64 and col. 7 line 16).

Regarding claims 12-13, Schneider discloses the first and second communications system including in a single communications system, wherein the communication system includes at least two communication forms (figure 4).

Regarding claim 14, Nabavi discloses the programmable surveillance system being further configured and arranged to gather and deliver image data to the second communications system responsive to the request (page 5 lines 12-18).

Regarding claim 15, Nabavi discloses the camera including a video camera and wherein the image data includes video data (page 3 lines 19-20).

Regarding claims 16-17, Nabavi discloses the programmable surveillance system including a microphone configured and arrange to capture audio, wherein the captured audio is processed as data by the first computer arrangement for transfer over the second communications system, wherein the second computer arrangement processes audio data, wherein the programmable surveillance system is configured and arrange to gather audio in response to the request (page 7 lines 27-28).

Regarding claims 23-24, Nabavi teaches the programmable surveillance system to establish a secure link, i.e., an encrypted link, with the second computer arrangement by encoding the image data including a password prior to deliver the encoded image data over the second communication network, wherein the second computer arrangement is adapted to decode the encoded image data using the password (page 6 lines 8-17).

Regarding claims 25-26, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claims 27-29, Nabavi discloses to gather image data, wherein the image data includes video data as streaming video over the Internet (page 5 lines 9-23).

Regarding claims 31-34, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 23-24.

Regarding claim 35, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 16-17.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325248A) in view of Schneider et al. (US PAT. 5,929,897 hereinafter Schneider) as applied in claim1 above, and further in view of Fujiwara et al. (JP 09330283A hereinafter Fujiwara).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Nabavi and Schneider differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching at least one of the first and the second communication systems including an email system. However, Fujiwara teaches a system for alarm monitoring by electronic mail system (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Nabavi and Schneider in having at least one of the first and the second communication systems including an email system, as per teaching of Fujiwara, in order to automatically inform an individual or group of fault occurrence by selecting a reported party according to the fault contents of fault alarm information.

5. Claims 7, 11 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325248A) in view of Schneider et al. (US PAT. 5,929,897 hereinafter Schneider) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Newlin (US PAT. 6,011,579).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Nabavi and Schneider differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching the first communication system including a telephone, wherein the programmable surveillance system is adapted to receive a telephone call from the telephone and, in response to the telephone call, offer an audio menu of choices for delivery of the video data, wherein the telephone is adapted to deliver a response to the audio menu, and wherein the programmable surveillance system is further adapted to respond to the response to the audio menu. However, Newlin teaches a video access apparatus (150, figure 3) being adapted to receive a call from a telephone (295, figure 3) and offer an audio menu of choice for establishing video communication including delivering video data, in order to make user friendly (col. 16 line 10 through col. 17 line 51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Nabavi and Schneider including the telephone, wherein the programmable surveillance system is adapted to receive the telephone call from the telephone and offer the audio menu of choices for delivery of the video data in response to the telephone call, as per teaching of Newlin, in order to make user friendly.

Regarding claim 11, Nabavi discloses the programmable surveillance system (8, figure 1) is programmed with an access code and adapted to request the access code in response to a call and automatically access and deliver image data to the second communication system in response to the access code being entered (page 5 lines 6-18 and 24-31). Nabavi differs from the

Art Unit: 2643

claimed invention in not specifically teaching the first communication system including a telephone. However, Newlin teaches a video access apparatus (150, figure 3) being adapted to receive a call from a telephone (295, figure 3) for deliver image data in response to the call from the telephone in order to make user friendly (col. 16 line 10 through col. 17 line 51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nabavi including the telephone, as per teaching of Newlin, in order to make user friendly.

Regarding claim 36 and 37, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 7.

6. Claims 9-10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325248A) in view of Schneider et al. (US PAT. 5,929,897 hereinafter Schneider) as applied in claims above, and further in view of Richard, III et al. (US PAT. 5,790,174 hereinafter Richard).

Regarding claims 9-10, Nabavi teaches the programmable surveillance system automatically accessing and delivering image data (page 8 lines 13-19). The combination of Nabavi and Schneider differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching the request for image data including the provision of a caller ID number, wherein the programmable surveillance system is programmed with at least one stored caller ID number, and wherein the programmable surveillance system is adapted to detect the caller ID number of the request and compare the caller ID number with the at least one stored caller ID number and, in response to detecting a match, wherein each of the at least one stored caller ID numbers includes a

programmed communications delivery method, and wherein the programmable surveillance system is adapted to automatically access and deliver image data via the programmed communications delivery method corresponding to the matched caller ID number. However, Richard teaches to provide surveillance video data from a video information provider to subscriber including the provision of a user ID, wherein the video information provider is adapted to check whether the user ID is valid by comparing with at least one stored user ID number (col. 9 lines 55-59) in order to identify the subscriber for interactive video control. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Nabavi and Schneider in including the provision of a caller ID number, wherein the programmable surveillance system is programmed with at least one stored caller ID number, and wherein the programmable surveillance system is adapted to detect the caller ID number of the request and compare the caller ID number with the at least one stored caller ID number and, in response to detecting a match, wherein each of the at least one stored caller ID numbers includes a programmed communications delivery method, and wherein the programmable surveillance system is adapted to automatically access and deliver image data via the programmed communications delivery method corresponding to the matched caller ID number, as per teaching of Richard, in order to identify the subscriber for interactive video control.

Regarding claim 30, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 9-10.

Art Unit: 2643

7. Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325248A) in view of Schneider et al. (US PAT. 5,929,897 hereinafter Schneider) as applied in claims above, and further in view of Mun et al. (US PAT. 6,094,213 hereinafter Mun).

Regarding claims 18-20, the combination of Nabavi and Schneider differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching the programmable surveillance system includes a videoconferencing device, wherein the videoconferencing device has a multi-processor architecture that processes video data using a specialized DSP arrangement and a built in display. However, Mun teaches a computer conferencing system with videophone connection function having multiprocessor architecture that processes video data using specialized DSP (figure 4 and col. 4 line 46 through col. 5 line 22) and a built-in display (figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Nabavi and Schneider in having videoconferencing device, wherein the videoconferencing device has the multi-processor architecture that processes video data using the specialized DSP arrangement and the built in display, as per teaching of Mun, in order to enable video conferencing between computer surveillance systems.

Regarding claim 21, Nabavi discloses the programmable surveillance system including a built-in integrated Internet circuit access arrangement (figure 1).

Regarding claim 22, Mun teaches the second computer arrangement including a video conferencing device (col. 2 lines 38-52 and col. 6 lines 11-28).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Higashimura et al. (US PAT. 6,747,554) discloses a network surveillance unit receiving a request from a display terminal through a network and transmitting the coded image in accordance to the request (abstract).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Eng whose telephone number is 703-308-9555. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fri 7:30 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A. Kuntz can be reached on 703-305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



George Eng
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643